

From: Irvin Cohen
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/11/03 9:40AM
Subject: CLECs

46-48

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Powell

I write as a concerned citizen on the upcoming decision by the FCC to overturn past regulations relative to the CLECs and the regional Bell Systems. If the FCC goes through with its plans to limit access by the CLECs to the **Bell** Systems by substantially increasing the cost the CLECs have to pay to have access to those systems American consumers will be laying out tens of billions of additional dollars to the old Bell Systems. This is in effect a hefty tax increase to the American consumer at the worst possible time. The president of the U.S. is attempting pass sweeping tax cuts in an attempt to bring our country out of one of its worse recessions in memory. The FCC decision to increase telephone costs to the average consumer flies right in the face of what he's attempting to accomplish.

Consumers account for two-thirds of America's GDP. At this time they have one of the highest debt loads in history and consumer confidence is falling on a month to month basis. Added tax increases in the form of higher telephone costs is unbelievably damaging to consumer "purchasing power" and would come at the worse possible time. One has to be careful that policies that seemed appropriate at one time are not counter productive at other times.

Respectively, Irvin Cohen

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

From: J W
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/11/03 2:08PM
Subject: 2 steps back ..

I am interested in knowing where is the place to send one's opinion on matters being decided by the FCC. I want to get my opinion to the right place. It regards "The FCC is considering the most significant telecommunications reforms since Congress passed the 1996 Act" I am overseas and far from the U.S. getting ready to defend freedom at the Presidents Command and I wonder to myself what is happening back home? Big business gaining a monopoly again over the consumer? I worked once upon a time for a little competitor and I can't begin to tell you how nice it was to hear the customer's voice on the phone or read the text of their e-mail, telling us that we were offering a service that the Bells could not. Service! Treating customers as the life blood of our business. Not a number a statistic, and definately not in the unsatisfactory manner that the big boys had. Are we going back to the negative customer experience? Are we punishing all the investments made by the little companies that wanted to compete under the 1996 act? How about the small invesetor who contributed to them? Are they to suffer so that the fat cats can riegn supreme again? These questions go through my mind as I see the news and wait to hit the desert sand and it makes me wish I had other thoughts to dominate them. Ones of fair laws in a free country. I don't have the best words to describe but that's my opinion for who wants it.

Kind regards,
James wagner
Private First Class
U.S. Army

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day
<http://shopping.yahoo.com>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Janet Unger
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/11/03 4:30PM
Subject: Individual consumer feedback - listen to the Consumer watchdog groups

You claim to want the general public's feedback on the rules you are about to decide on. Here is some:

If you rule in favor of the Bells you will be voting against the ONLY local competition we have ever seen. The attitude of both Mr. Tauzin and yourself is frightening - I can only conclude that the Bell lobbyists shower you with gifts and money. Listen to the consumer watchdog groups! The Bell network was partially paid for with MY money - for them to whine about sharing it is pure baloney.

Janet Unger
21 Forestdale Rd
Kinnelon, NJ 07405

Janet Unger

Find out who's green and who's not! Use Care2's Green Thumbs-up!
<http://www.care2.com/go/z/4029>

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: k.hahn
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/11/03 10:33PM
Subject: deregulation of the telecommunications industry

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

I'm concerned about the discussion of deregulating the telecommunications industry. While it is clear that there is competition in the long distance market, as evidenced by the significant drop in prices, it is equally clear that there is little, if any, competition in the local market, as evidenced by the lack of drop in prices. In fact, the Baby Bells continue to complain that the rates they are allowed to charge for the use of their facilities are too low and that they're losing money.

The cable industry is another area that shows lack of competition; the prices have gone up every year. However, where internet access **is** in question, it can generally be shown that there is some competition there: the cable industry provides broadband while the Baby Bells provide DSL, at a somewhat similar price. Nevertheless, the Baby Bells are complaining that they are being forced to charge too high a rate for DSL; I would tend to agree. It is time we stopped viewing networking, telecommunications, and cable as distinct services.

Expecting telecommunication competitors to build their own **network(s)** is not a viable option. While building a backbone network is certainly possible (many of them already have this), extending the network the "last mile" is much more difficult. In particular, obtaining right-of-ways is time consuming, and prohibitively expensive. For new buildings, everyone may be on an equal playing field, but the vast majority of the last mile has already been laid. **As** a result, competitors can be effectively kept out of the market for years, while trying to obtain right-of-ways for the existing market.

One solution that seems to meet most of the needs is to split the companies, both Baby Bells and cable companies, into transport facility providers and service providers. Then we could see the effect of real competition on prices for the transport facilities. Where there is competition, the respective state utility commissions could allow the Baby Bell transport providers to set their rates as they see fit. This would put all of the service providers on an equal footing, because none could claim that the Baby Bell service provider was being underwritten by the Baby Bell transport provider.

This solution also solves another problem: it seems absurd to me that I should pay \$40/month for local service, \$55/month for cable broadband access, \$30/month for satellite tv access, etc. Each of these includes fees for transport facilities and fees for services. Instead, I should be able to pick the transport facility that has the best price/quality tradeoff for my purposes. Then I should be able to get local telephone service, internet access, tv channels, and any other service over top of that one transport facility.

I know you have a difficult job ahead of you. **As** you consider the various opinions, please give the most weight to the voices of individuals, not the voice of the big businesses. To an extent, businesses represent people, too - the shareholders. However, that is obviously a lopsided representation. They also represent the employees, but that is only incidental, and rarely represents what is really "best" for the employee at a personal level.

Thank-you for taking the time to read this and consider these suggestions

Sincerely,
Jim Hahn

From: Michelle Kregel
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/12/03 9:20AM
Subject: <No Subject>

<<UNE-Platform Letter Michael Powell.doc>>

Thank You,
Michelle Kregel
Access One. Inc.
LD Account Relations
800-804-8333 ext. 949

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



February 12th, 2003

Dear Chairman Michael Powell:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in the SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" – the UNE-Platform – to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Michelle Kregel
Long Distance Account Relations
Access One Incorporated

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

From: schulman
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/12/03 3:12PM
Subject: Fw: Regional Bell Operating Companies: BLS. Q, SBCK, VZ; new FCC regulations

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

The following was mis-directed -- it was intended for Chairman Powell and SEC Commissioners

----- Original Message -----

From: schulman
 To: Ecfshelp@fcc.gov
 Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2003 4:48 PM
 Subject: Regional Bell Operating Companies: BLS. Q, SBCK, VZ; new FCC regulations

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners:

It was disappointing to learn that you have delayed acting on the needed new regulations to recognize the necessity to enhance the RBOCs.

I am totally uninvolved with the industry, and my only personal connection derives from some shares of ATT I purchased some 40 or so years ago. Since the breakup of almost 20 years ago I have been the owner of T, NYNEX, BELL ATLANTIC, BELL SOUTH, US WEST, AMERITECH, PACIFIC TELESIS, SOUTHWEST BELL, and the various spinoffs and derivatives: all the RBOCs, Lucent, Media One, Avaya, Comcast, and others I cannot recall offhand. As you know, it has been a technological and regulatory rollercoaster during these decades. Hardly anyone has known how to make rational business decisions, since no one could foresee the impact and inter-relationship among fiber optic cable, e-mail, cable TV, cell phones, etc,

I had some indirect connection with the industry during 1993-7 when I served, first, as a councilman and then as the full-time Mayor of White Plains., and we had to review requests by MetroMedia Fiber and others in the industry as they sought to build out a fiber optic network. That required city permits as well as compliance with various state requirements and also impacted the telephone company and the electric utility who had to make available their conduits. We all know how the initial enthusiasm for those kinds of telecommunications investments have been overtaken by new fiscal and marketing realities. And there are literally hundreds of other new entities that can fairly be said to be parasitic on the existing and well established bell companies. I use the word parasitic in a non-pejorative sense: how can one deny that their existence relies completely on the existence of the bell companies? - and, of course, on their capital investments.

Only a wealthy country like ours could have gone through the ATT breakup and the radical restructuring of a basic industry -which we once called a natural monopoly! - and somehow survived. Fortunately we never had to go through a privatization mode.

What I hope you will now do is recognize the natural resource - albeit man-created - that is the bell company systems and that you will establish rules that will allow them to flourish. I must say that I am dubious about devolving this upon the 50 states, and thereby creating a permanent maelstrom of state-by-state politicking and resultant confusion and, dare I say, potential corruption. Thank you for your attention and for your devotion to the larger national public good. - S J SCHULMAN

From: STOCKZRUS@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/13/03 7:49AM
Subject: Fcc Comissioners

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

CC: kabernat@fcc.fcc.gov.
govmcopps@fcc.gov,
"Adelstein, Commissioner" <jadelste@fcc.gov>,
"KJMWEB, KM" <kjmweb@fcc.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1_c3.30461756.2b7ceed6_boundary"
X-Mailer: 6.0sub 10524
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 13 Feb 2003 12:49:37.0244 (UTC) FILETIME=[5DB6C1C0:01C2D35E]

--part1_c3.30461756.2b7ceed6_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Save the American consumer

Vote to KEEP LINESHARING

Vote to KEEP COMPETITION ALIVE IN AMERICA

Vote to ALLOW CLECS ACCESS TO THE LAST MILE

Thank you, a concerned voter and consumer of DSL

--part1_c3.30461756.2b7ceed6_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML>

Save the American consumer=20

Vote to KEEP LINESHARING

Vote to KEEP COMPETITION ALIVE IN AMERICA

Vote to ALLOW CLECS ACCESS TO THE LAST MILE=20

Thank you, a concerned voter and consumer of DSL</HTML>

--part1_c3.30461756.2b7ceed6_boundary--

From: FishernanBOZ@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/13/03 8:03AM
Subject: Vote to protect the consumer!

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Keep CLEC access to last mile copper

Keep LINESHARING for COMPETITIVE CARRIERS

Keep AMERICAN CONSUMERS ALIVE AND WELL

Keep DSL COMPETITIVE
NO MORE BELLE MONOPOLIES

Thank You.

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Mdadokjr@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/13/03 8:18AM
Subject: Elimination of Line Sharing

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Mr. Powell:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

As a consumer, I am very much against the elimination or curtailing of line sharing. I believe that a significant expansion of DSL will only occur if competition is **preserved**. I also believe that a significant expansion of broadband use by businesses and consumers will have a very positive effect on the economy.

Sincerely,
Michael D O'Keeffe
2/13/03

From: David S. Isenberg
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Kevin Martin. Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: 2/13/03 8:33AM
Subject: Corrected version: Preserving line sharing

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

The Honorable Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20054

A corrected version of my February 6, 2003 letter
(Corrections made primarily to last paragraph.)

Re: Triennial Review of the Commission's Unbundling Rules
CC Docket Nos. **96-98, 98-147**, 01-338
Subject. Line Sharing

Dear Chairman Powell,

I'm writing to you as a U.S. citizen, beholden to ILEC, CLEC, ISP, cableco, equipment manufacturer, or system integrator, who would like to see the benefits of technology and architecture improvements, such as those reflected in Moore's Law and The End-to-End Principle, realized for the benefit of all U.S. citizens

Recently, I co-signed a letter asking you to forbear from any FCC action that would slow down what we see as the slow-motion failure of the ILECs. Now, before the Triennial Review comment period ends, I'd like to address another topic that came up in a recent discussion with your Special Policy Advisor, Jon Cody.

The issue is line sharing. I sympathize with competitive DSL providers who need access to ILEC local loops, but the issue is much, much larger. Fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) will soon be common in the United States, while the absolute number of FTTH homes is small, it grew at over 100% last year and this year.

Each fiber affords DC-to-daylight bandwidth. With currently available technology, a single fiber can carry 40 gigabits on each of 40 wavelengths; theoretically, the entire busy hour throughput of conventional U.S. telephony could be carried on two fibers. Looking at fiber capacity another way, 100 Mbit/s FTTH can be installed for a capital expenditure of US\$600 to \$3000 per home. Within a few years gigabit, and then 10 gigabit, fiber interfaces will be equally affordable.

In other words, where fiber exists, there is a lot to share.

Once fiber exists in a neighborhood, there is no economic

The ILECs have promised investment in advanced network technology in return for rate relief. But this is not a new promise, and the ILEC trail of broken promises is well-worn. I urge you to resist calls to weaken or eliminate line sharing, to be cognizant that changes in line sharing regulations for copper loops could set a dangerous precedent for fiber, and to resist proposals like that of Commissioner Martin's, which would have the FCC forbear from any regulation of new fiber.

David S. Isenberg
isen@isen.com
203-661-4798

David S. Isenberg isen@isen.com
isen.com, inc. 888-isen.com (inside US)
<http://isen.com/> 203-661-4798 (direct line)

* _____ isen.com _____ *

-- The brains behind The Stupid Network --

* _____ isen.com _____ *

CC: Jon Cody, Robert Pepper, Robert Cannon

From: Jennifer Whaley
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/13/03 9:25AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Jennifer L. Whaley

Access One, Inc

820 W Jackson

6th Floor

Chicago IL 60607

ph 312.441.9947

fx 312.441 1010

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary



February 5th, 2003

Dear Chairman Michael Powell:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in the SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" – the UNE-Platform – to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely

Jennifer L. Whaley
Assistant to the Controller
Access One Incorporated

From: Dorr, Lynda PSC
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 2/13/03 9:30AM
Subject: FW: e-mail to FCC commissioners

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

February 12, 2003

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Chairman Michael K. Powell

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Jonathon S. Adelstein

Federal Communications Commission

Re: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 01-338

Dear Commissioners:

We appreciate this opportunity to contribute to your deliberations on the FCC Triennial Review. We expect the outcome of this complex proceeding will have lasting effects on the telecommunications industry that hopefully will ensure sustainable competition in all markets across geographic and product lines. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 established shared responsibility between the states and the FCC for the implementation of the law. Accordingly, we appreciate your individual efforts to work carefully through the issues and to seek state commissioners' recommendations regarding the availability of unbundled network elements (UNEs).

We endorse the proposal submitted by NARUC on February 6, 2003, and encourage you to give it considerable weight in your deliberations. The guiding principles recently proposed by NARUC would foster sustainable competition and efficient investment in the telecommunications sector. In particular, we urge you to ensure that any removal of UNEs used to provide mass market consumer services involve reasonable transition periods with state commission oversight. This would allow state commissions to smooth regulatory transitions and hopefully avoid any unnecessary service disruptions to consumers and telecommunications providers.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on these important issues. Please contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Chairperson Burneatta Bridge

Commissioner Ave Bie

Commissioner Robert Garvin

CC: Bridge. Burnie PSC. Bie. Ave PSC, Garvin. Bert PSC. jramsay@naruc.org

From: Marie Brown
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/11/03 9:10AM
Subject: Baby Bells

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission

As a shareholder and a captive of the bell system, I certainly hope you will be able to ~~institute some~~ fairness in the pricing of the Bell Services to rivals. What other industry is forced to ~~sell to competitors~~ at a loss rate?

We are retired and depend on dividends to supplement our pensions. If the FCC continues to go for 'competition' there will only be more **loss** of jobs and more **loss** of stock market wealth. Quest may as well go under, of the three remaining Baby Bells, it is my understanding that only Verizon is on somewhat firm footing.

The phone system has been a disaster ever since some congressman (woman) decided there should be competition. I do not know one person who has been happy with their phone service since ATT was broken up. My suspicion is that the congressperson who instituted the change 'made out like a bandit' from one of the upstarts. the public didn't win. Prices have risen and ~~service~~ absolutely stink.

I applaud your efforts to bring back to the market competition through FAIR MARKET PRACTICES, not what's going on today.

Marie Brown, Cookeville, TN

RECEIVED

From: okie rigney
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/7/03 9:25AM
Subject: Verizon tech's view

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Hello Mr. Powell. My name is Okie Rigney. I am a 36 year old father of two, a Gulf War veteran, and a Cable Maint. Tech. with Verizon for 3 years now. I love My job and I don't want to lose it. As a technician that delivers and repairs the phone service I see first hand the unfairness of "CLECS". I often get the puzzled questioning from "CLEC"s customers when they see my van pull in their driveway with Verizon written on it instead of the name of some other supposed phone company. I find it crazy how the "CLEC"s can be called a phone company but not do the actual work that makes a phone company a phone company. A billing company that gets to stand between **us** and the end customer siphoning money off of our investment, sweat, and service is how I see the "CLECs. And now I'm afraid that we are being bled to the point of jobs having to be cut. We already lost several thousand in the North East. We are hurting. **We** have been cutting expenses everywhere, tools, overtime, new cable and even cable maintenance. **Part** of it is the economy but it doesn't help to lose 40% of revenue to each "CLEC line yet the work to service it isn't reduced. Everyone ask about DSL, but is clear, we will not invest in it when a "CLEC can freeloader on it. So everyone is going Cable Vision Broadband which doesn't share it's facilities.

Mr. Powell I live in a trailer. never owned a car less than ten years old. I started this job at bottom pay and my family made sacrifices because in the end it would pay off. I thought of it as an investment. Now only a year from top pay and at the point where I should be able to buy a house. I see my investment going to some one **else** who will never know the fear of being 30 feet high on pole secured only by two tiny hooks into the wood.

Okie Rigney
Cable Maintenance Technician # 426
Verizon 553 Leesville rd. Lynchburg. Va. 24505

From: Herman
To: Mike Powell
Date: 211 1/033:00PM
Subject: Deregulation of Local Access Facilities

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Powell,

Last Friday's Washington Post carried an article in its Business Section stating, "We cannot expect [the phone companies] to invest in new facilities when they are required to share such facilities with competitors at below market prices." It strikes me this is at the heart of the local access deregulation controversy. However, I doubt that the solution currently advocated by the RBOCs (Regional Bell Operating Companies) and the LECs (Local Exchange Carriers) to stop the discounted sale of their facilities to their competitors is the answer, nor is the continued sale of local access circuits to the CLECs (Competitive Local Exchange Carriers) at discounted prices any better. I believe (for the reasons detailed below) that a better approach lies in divesting the RBOCs and the LECs of their local access operations and establishing those operations as regulated monopolies in each state offering local access circuits to all the competing companies at tariffed rates.

The Washington Post article further noted it is not realistic to expect capital investments in the local access infrastructure by any Competitive LECs on the scale needed for real competition in that market using today's copper and fiber based technology. The CLECs are focused primarily on serving concentrations of the largest business, government, and commercial users of telecommunications. Much has been done for those groups, but most telecommunications users must still depend upon the RBOC and LEC local access networks. As a result, the promise of real competition and the consequent price reductions that have typified the long distance market for all telecommunications users has not been achieved in the local access market

The CLECs cannot afford, nor do they have the time to build a pervasive, competing local access network. It took 25 years, starting **after** the end of World War II, to build out the last half of the nation's local access infrastructure and thereby extending it to 90+ percent of the nation's homes and businesses. As a consequence, most residential users have not benefited from the limited competition that currently exists in the local access market and he/she does not have the variety of choice that would exist in the truly competitive long distance market. Competition in local access **is** primarily only growing to the extent that Local Public Service Commissions rule that the RBOC and LEC local access facilities must be made available to competitors below their retail prices.

All this results in a de facto monopoly for the RBOCs and LECs in local access service, which must be the "cash cow" fueling investments in a variety of ventures. If there is any question of what local access revenues mean to them, open the Telephone Directory and **start** paging through it. My guess is that every name in the Directory is providing something on the order of \$30 to \$35 revenue each and every month. In the past, the assurance of that steady revenue stream made possible the connection of every home to the current local access network. The RBOCs and LECs promise (once regulatory relief is granted) they will upgrade their local access networks, but in the absence of regulation, how can that be guaranteed and

how will competitive pricing be encouraged?

It seems to me the answer lies in considering the electric industry's deregulation model. Generation of electricity (read long distance) was deregulated, while distribution (read local access) continues, for all practical purposes, as a local regulated monopoly. It seems to me that **is** a model that ought to be considered and evaluated for the telecommunications industry

Such a model envisions separating the RBOCs and other LECs into regulated and non-regulated entities. The local access facilities and switches would be part of the regulated entity. Rates would be set, as in the past, to recoup capital and expenses, plus a regulated rate of return. The service could then be sold to all comers (including the unregulated subsidiaries of those RBOCs and LECs). The question of any reluctance to invest in local access plant becomes mute (since a rate of return is "guaranteed").

RBOCs have made substantial capital investments in an array of competitive ventures since deregulation. With this model, we are assured that the capital available from local access operations will be used for local access upgrading. This approach would, I believe, assure true competition in the local access market, and achieve significant reductions in local access pricing.

It should be noted, that local access competitors have already gained a small share of the local access market and achieved some measure of competitive inroads into the RBOC and LEC markets in the current environment using the RBOC and LEC local access facilities. This is admittedly an awkward arrangement, fraught with the kinds of problems cited in the Washington Post article. Most important, it does not hold the promise of wide spread availability of improved local access services. nor does it provide the fundamentals for the most effective price competition.

The unknown in all this is what future technologies may come on the scene to alter the current need for extraordinary capital outlays by the CLECs to build their own local access networks. While a consideration, it is too clouded with uncertainty to impact decisions today about the current situation.

Thank you,
Herman Anschuetz

FYI: I have been retired for 12 years from ATBT, after working 35 years at Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. until Divestiture and then at AT&T for 6 more years as we moved into a competitive business model. I held various mid-level Field Operations Management positions.

CC: Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Mark Buse
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/6/03 1:48AM
Subject: request that FCC respond to written comments submitted 16 days ago

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

I respectfully request that you or your staff respond to my written comments regarding your proposals to undermine the 1996 Telecom Act and entrench the RBOC monopolies.

The vigorous public opposition to your actions must be included in the public record for this matter.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Mark Buse" <Mark.Buse@iLaunchVentures.com>
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>
Cc: <vice.president@whitehouse.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2003 12:09 PM
Subject: Utterly foolish to suggest duplicial local access networks

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

Your recent remarks to the Senate suggesting that CLECs need to build their own local access networks shows that you are either blatantly biassed in favor of the RBOCs, you have an interest in the RBOCs, or you are completely incompetent with regard to the telecommunications business

In most parts of the country

- 1 RBOCs are a legally & economically entrenched monopoly, and pay off local politicians to maintain that effect
2. Customer densities are far too low to ever justify duplicate local networks
3. Wireless and satellite alternatives are still far too expensive for most users.
- 4 Other line utilities with physical access are afraid to compete with RBOCs.

I've always believed in free markets where they are possible, and voted Republican accordingly. However, idiots like you undermine my faith in the proposition that the Republican Party really believes in free markets. You seem instead to be interested in reinforcing the most disgusting robber-barrons like Verizon.

If you would bother to talk to people who have lived through all of the disgusting lies and propaganda put forward publicly by the RBOCs while they steal and destroy legitimate competition in private, you would be proposing DIVESTITURE of local infrastructure to level the playing field and encourage investment in local access networks.

Senator Hollings may go over the top with some of his speeches, but when he lectured you on the damage that will be caused by relaxing regulatory constraints on the RBOCs, he was absolutely correct.

Even under the current regulatory regime, I have watched while the RBOCs bled all of their local competition to death. Every last CLEC in our area was driven into bankruptcy because Verizon obstructed every last order customers like **us** tried to place with the CLECs. Every imaginable excuse and administrative incompetence was employed to destroy the possibility that we might use the competition. Verizon has even used their control over the local access network to interfere with the unregulated market of Internet access.

Finally, your suggestions about alternate local access methods is analogous to leaving all roadways in a region in the hands of a monopoly and then suggesting to the victims of that monopoly that if they want alternatives. they can build them. Such a suggestion is no less impractical than suggesting that communities invest in duplicate local access networks when those local communities have paid many times over for the access networks that are already illegitimately owned by the **RBOCs**. The answer is further divestiture, not retrenchment of monopolies.

Regards,
Mark Buse
Managing Partner
iLaunch Ventures, LLC - Management Consultants
3600 Smith Avenue, Ste 2600
Everett, **WA** 98201-4544
866.launch.8
Mark.Buse@iLaunchVentures.com

CC: vice.president@whitehouse.gov

From: Noel Thilagam
To: Mike Powell
Date: 215103 7:52PM
Subject: America the Beautiful-Save our right to choose

RECEIVED

MAR 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell:

Please read the following mail (letter).

Thank You.

Noel Thilagam

<<UNE-Platform Letter Michael Powell.doc>>



February 5th, 2003

Dear Chairman Michael Powell

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in the SBC territories. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" - the UNE-Platform - to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Noel Thilagam
Sales Executive
Access One Incorporated

From: Dick Wilson
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/5/03 5:26PM
Subject: Dear Commissioner Powell I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform"

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, NetPort - Datacom, Inc is in the process filing with the Washington Utilities Transportation Committee (WUTC) for the rights to provide local telephone service in State of Washington. The company is convinced we can increase our opportunity for success largely because it will utilize the combination of "unbundled network elements" - the UNE-Platform - to serve our potential customers. In-order to achieve our goals, it is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort that will limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Dick Wilson
NetPort-Datacom Inc.
6252 Harbour Heights Parkway
Mukilteo, WA 98275 USA
Tel. 425-493-0168
Fax: 425-740-9114
Cel: 425-503-3371
dwilson@nwlink.com
Dick Wilson
NetPort-Datacom Inc.
6252 Harbour Heights Parkway
Mukilteo, WA 98275 USA
Tel. 425-493-0168
Fax: 425-740-9114
Cel: 425-503-3371
dwilson@nwlink.com
Dick Wilson
NetPort-Datacom Inc.
6252 Harbour Heights Parkway

Mukilteo. **WA 98275 USA**

Tel: 425-493-0168

Fax. 425-740-9114

Cel: 425-503-3371

dwilson@nwlinc.com

IncrediMail - Email has finally evolved - [Click Here](#)